

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,731	06/13/2001	Youichiro Nishikawa	021380	4948

38834 7590 08/26/2004

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

TODD, GREGORY G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/880,731	Applicant(s) NISHIKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory G Todd	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a first office action in response to application filed, with the above serial number, on 13 June 2001 in which claims 1-16 are presented for examination. Claims 1-16 are therefore pending in the application.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 13 recite the limitation "the user" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claims 1 and 13 recite the limitation "the sent logical address" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claims 1 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The last limitation stating "when a network node of the user...to the node as a client" is indefinite and is not clear on what is being defined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2157

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al (hereinafter "Johnson", 6,580,950) in view of Feder et al (hereinafter "Feder", 6512754).

Johnson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including networked appliance controlling (see abstract).

As per Claim 1, Johnson teaches an information processing apparatus operable from a remote user comprising:

a communication unit which provides a function to interface with a network (at least Fig. 1; global network with data center);

a connection request unit which generates a request to establish a connection with the network (at least col. 7, lines 47-67; requesting connection and transmitting connect command);

a server function unit which provides a predetermined service, when a network node of the user accesses the apparatus using the sent logical address, to the node as a client (at least Fig. 5; col. 4, lines 16-39; control unit and/or data center with servers).

Johnson fails to explicitly disclose an address holder which holds a logical address allotted when the connection is established. However, the use and

Art Unit: 2157

advantages for using logical addresses is extremely well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Feder. Feder teaches using PPP IP address assignment for users on a home network (at least Feder col. 9 line 47 - col. 10 line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Feder's use of address allotment for end users as this is very well known in the art since Johnson's system operates on networks such as the Internet (see col. 4, lines 41-48) where IP address allotment is a standard practice performed for connecting users.

As per Claim 2, the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a monitor unit which detects a trigger signal transmitted by a remote node in compliance with a communication protocol which does not require connection to the network, wherein the connection request unit generates the request upon detecting the signal (at least col. 5, lines 1-6, 63-67; alert signal upon event-occurring connection).

As per Claim 3, the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising:

- a second communication unit which communicates with an external appliance which is under the control of the apparatus (at least col. 5, lines 29-52; control unit); and

- an appliance controller which controls the external appliance via the second communication unit (at least col. 5, lines 29-52; control unit controlling devices);

wherein the server function unit, as the predetermined service, receives an instruction for the control of the external appliance from the user node and transmits the instruction to the appliance controller and the appliance controller converts the instruction to a control command of the external appliance and sends the command to the appliance via the second communication unit (at least col. 7, lines 47-67; col. 5, lines 29-52; user connecting to control unit through web browser and providing commands to control various devices).

As per Claim 4, the apparatus of the claim 1 further comprising a second monitor unit which generates a trigger signal when status of the external appliance reported via the second communication unit satisfies a predetermined condition, wherein the connection request unit generates the request upon detecting the signal generated by the second monitor unit (at least col. 5, lines 1-6, 40-52; lighting controls transmitting to control unit which lights are activated, etc).

As per Claim 5, the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a third monitor unit which generates a trigger signal when information from a sensor sensing ambient environment satisfies a predetermined condition, wherein the connection request unit generates the request upon detecting the signal generated by the third monitor unit (at least col. 7, lines 6-15; col. 5 line 63 - col. 6 line 11; monitoring usage and consumption data and surpassing threshold levels).

As per Claim 6, the apparatus of claim 1 further comprising a disconnection request unit which disconnects from the network when access from the logical address has been suspended for a predetermined period (at least col. 5, lines 1-26).

Art Unit: 2157

As per Claim 7, the apparatus of claim 2 further comprising an authentication unit which determines whether the remote node that issued the trigger signal is a user node managed by the apparatus (at least col. 6, lines 36-50; user name and password).

As per Claim 12, Johnson teaches an information processing method operable from a remote user comprising:

- waiting in a stand-by mode in an off-line state as an initial state (at least col. 5, lines 1-20; connection to network upon event-occurrence);

- establishing connection with a network upon detecting a predetermined trigger signal (at least col. 5, lines 1-20, 63-67; connection to network upon event-occurrence / alert signal);

- sending the held logical address to a network node of the user (at least col. 5 line 63 - col. 6 line 11; reporting to user); and

- providing a predetermined service, when a network node of the user connects to the sent logical address, to the node as a client (at least col. 6, lines 13-50; various uses of controlling devices).

Johnson fails to explicitly disclose receiving and holding a logical address allotted when the connection is established. However, the use and advantages for using logical addresses is extremely well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Feder. Feder teaches using PPP IP address assignment for users on a home network (at least Feder col. 9 line 47 - col. 10 line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate

Art Unit: 2157

Feder's use of address allotment for end users as this is very well known in the art since Johnson's system operates on networks such as the Internet (see col. 4, lines 41-48) where IP address allotment is a standard practice performed for connecting users.

As per Claim 15, Johnson teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein said network is the internet, but fails to explicitly disclose the connection request unit relies on Point-to-point Protocol and wherein the logical address is an Internet Protocol address. However, the use and advantages for using logical addresses is extremely well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Feder. Feder teaches using PPP IP address assignment for users on a home network (at least Feder col. 9 line 47 - col. 10 line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Feder's use of PPP connection and IP address usage for end users as this is very well known in the art since Johnson's system operates on networks such as the Internet (see col. 4, lines 41-48) where IP address usage is a standard practice performed for connecting users and PPP connections are standard ways to connect to the internet.

Claim 13 does not add or define any additional limitations over claim 1 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 14 does not add or define any additional limitations over claim 12 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

Art Unit: 2157

Claim 16 does not add or define any additional limitations over claim 15 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

Claims 8-11 do not add or define any additional limitations over claims 3-6 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ryan et al, Myer et al, Humpleman et al, and Kikinis are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention.

Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G Todd whose telephone number is (703)305-5343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd 

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100


SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER